

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 93 04:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #349
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 27 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 349

Today's Topics:

Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)
Time out

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 26 SEP 93 22:40:00 GMT
From: tribune.usask.ca!skyfox!a01muma@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I personally think that amateurs should be required to learn Morse Code before making idiots of themselves on the HF bands. I completely agree with Pat. In Canada the highest requirement is 12 wpm, but you have no HF privileges without Morse Code. But, Morse Code is probably the easiest part of Ham Radio. Using SuperMorse I managed to get my five words-per-minute in six days, and for those who think it was an isolated case, my girlfriend got hers in seven days. I took some time off then, but once I got to work, I got my 12 wpm in three weeks. The main reason I think some people have trouble with CW is that they have been told how 'hard' it is to learn. Some people think age is a factor, but I can't find one person in the world who couldn't learn a foreign alphabet within a few days. I think that the US should change their band privilege system and only allow people with Morse Code to operate on the HF bands, and keep the foul-mouthed idiots on CB or at least local repeaters.

Hope you are all still awake,
Scott -<:=) VE5AXX

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 1993 09:47:02 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Time out
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In an effort to cool things off a bit in the ongoing code/no code debate let's take a break for station identification. Those of you who are having difficulty in either learning the code or picking up your speed, let me share what worked for me as a young pup back in 1965; I believe this parallels the ARRL code book method (it's been since '65 since I last looked at it!)

Break up all the characters into the following groups

Group 1:

Randomly send this group while your tape recoder is running; you'll want to send the characters as they would sound at say 15 wpm BUT you may leave as much space as you like BETWEEN the characters.

Once you've master group 1, then go on to

Group 2: - - - - -

Do the same as above. After you've mastered group 2, make a tape with the characters of groups 1 and 2 randomly mixed. Then comes

Group 3: . - . - - . - - -

Master this group, then mix with groups 1 and 2. Notice you are getting both sending and copying practice.

Group 4: - . - - - - - - -

Master and mix.

Group 5: . - - . . - - -

Group 6: - - . - - - - - - -

Group 7: . . - - - - -

Group 8: - - - - (not really a group, huh?) Might as well throw in . - - - and - - - .

Group 9: . - . - - . - - - (ah, the first prosign)

Group 10: -.- ---

Okay, you get the idea: each group has a particular pattern to it. Again, you want to master a group before you mix it with the preceding groups. I believe the key here is that you record each character at at least 15 wpm while the space between characters is what ever you feel comfortable with; you can shorten the space between characters after you hit say, 75%. And at the beginning of each new session, start your tape at the beginning with group 1: etc. Several short sessions per day is much better than one looooong session. Take the tape with you on your commute to and from work each day. Or, whistle in code license plates, billboards, bumper stickers.

Once you pass your General exam, if you choose never to use code again, then that's your business; no one will care. But at least then you'll have all that nice juicy HF spectrum at your disposal.

Okay, back to your regularly scheduled code/no code debate...

Jeff NH6IL (ex WA6QIJ; gee, do I have to keep saying this? Doggone you John!)

Date: 27 Sep 1993 03:44:18 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!asuvax!chnews!news@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CDxFnL.AwM@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Sep26.002916.9250@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <CDy3qp.Gqp@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

In article <CDy3qp.Gqp@news.Hawaii.Edu>
jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

{previous dialogue deleted}

>Read what you originally posted. My comments were directed to your stating
>that some people cannot spell, learn math, memorize code; to this I say BULL.
>Everyone has the ability to learn ANYTHING they set their mind to - NOTHING
>is out of reach. But motivation is something completely different. If you
>choose not to learn to spell, do math, know code, etc., then that's your
>business; but to say that you or someone else CAN'T learn is BULL.

My experience is somewhat different than this. I have been trying to
reach 13 wpm for over 30 years now. My experience was pretty much
that of everyone else in getting to 5 wpm - a few months at the most.
And I picked up a Technician class license as a first step in my

amateur career. But something happened when I tried anything faster than about 10 wpm. My perception of the code sounds degenerated into a series of random clicks that seemed to me to have no correlation to the text sent. I banged away at this for years with every tool I could find - Supermorse, on-the-air contacts, code tapes, Farnsworth, etc., etc. I estimate I have spent a few hundred hours over the years in futile code practice.

I don't think I am the only person in North America who can't learn the code. Perhaps, I am one of the few who has not gotten totally fed up with the hobby and gone on to other, more fruitful, pursuits. But I do think there are others like me - people with this peculiar inability to distinguish closely-spaced sounds. And I am convinced that it is a barrier that no amount of studying hard will overcome.

```
+-----+-----+
| Jim Bromley W5GYJ      | |
| Intel Corp. m/s C11-91 | | This message transmitted with
| 5000 W. Chandler Blvd. | | 100% recycled electrons.
| Chandler, AZ 85226     | |
| tel: 602-554-5183     | | Internet: jbromley@sedona.intel.com
+-----+-----+
```

Date: 26 Sep 93 15:00:50 GMT
From: ddsw1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <NHieac2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <CDxFnL.AwM@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Sep26.002916.9250@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

In article <1993Sep26.002916.9250@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> rcanders@nyx.UUCP (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

>But what good does learning Morse at speeds faster than 5 wpm.

A "word" for speed purposes is considered to be an average of 5 characters. That makes 5 WPM 25 chars per minute, about 2 seconds and change per char. At that rate you could look the character up on a chart with only a passing familiarity with the code.

The idea is to have operators who can copy Morse when they forget their charts. Perhaps we could allow an exemption for the 5 WPM for anyone who will have the chart tattooed on their left hand. :-)

>I might be willing to learn the speech of old farts (Morris) if only 5 wpm
>were required, but to waste time getting the speed up to 13 wpm, what a bogus
>pile of sh--. I have a limited amount of time there are many things more

>worthwhile doing that studying to increase ones Morse speed.
>
>I do not like wasting time doing or learning something useless because
>some old fart thinks it builds character.

Then you obviously never went to grade school, where "learning something useless because some old fart thinks it builds character" begins in the educational process (and, of course, continues throughout the entire process). Your sentence structure, improper punctuation and lack of use of the apostrophe for possessive case suggests you didn't learn or don't know what I learned in third grade, good evidence for such a wild assertion.

I too have a limited amount of time. There are many things more worthwhile doing that [sic] studying Political Science, or Ancient European History, or very basic Sociology, or Black History, or Macroeconomics to increase ones [sic] "well-rounded education". But if I want the damn college degree, then I'll knuckle under and do what the old farts want, without any choice in the matter.

>Busy work, the crutch of the lazy teacher.

Now that's true. But not all teachers are lazy. And one of the best teachers I ever had was forced by the school to assign a great deal of busywork as homework; given a choice, he'd have removed the requirement.

>BTY I read at 800 wpm any one who reads slower does it because they are
>too lazy to read faster ? NOT

I read at 1000 to 2500 WPM. So? All that means is that I can get through the chaff to find the wheat faster. Braggadocio in a run-on sentence without punctuation is a poor way to make a useless point.

>>Let me share three Vietnamese proverbs about learning with you:
>
>Don't bother.

You really seem to have a thing about avoiding ALL learning. It's too bad you took the time to figure out the PTT button, IMHO. But then again, from the tone of your article I'd guess you bought a rig with VOX in order not to be forced to learn all that.

--
+-----+
| Cliff Sharp | clifto@indep1.chi.il.us OR clifto@indep1.uucp |
| WA9PDM | Use whichever one works |
+-----+

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 1993 05:55:58 GMT

From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!indirect.com!indirect.com!kg7bk@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep26.002916.9250@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<CDy3qp.Gqp@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <285nii\$hds@chnews.intel.com>
Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>I do think there are others like me - people with this peculiar
>inability to distinguish closely-spaced sounds.

I've often wondered about handicapped hams. I know a blind guy who can copy CW just fine but has no idea what frequency he's on. Are deaf hams limited to vhf/uhf packet because they can't copy CW? Are there any deaf hams? With all the digital modes, including computer-copied CW, it would seem that manually copying CW is like having to know how to use a slide rule... Hey, Jim, maybe they will let you use your slide rule to copy CW.

73, kg7bk

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #349
